

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

In Paragraph 1 of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 5, 8-16, 19 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In addition, Examiner asserts that claims 13, 14 and 22 are unclear. Claims 4, 5, 18, and 19 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to provide antecedent basis for the second outlet. These amendments are supported by previous claims 4, 5, 18, and 19.

Claims 8 and 21 have been amended to make the meaning of the term "intermediate phase" more clear. These amendments are supported by page 7 line 28 of the specification through page 9 line 3.

Claims 9-16 have been amended so that they each depend on claim 8, and claims 22-25 have been amended so that they depend from claims 21. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 5, 8-16 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In Paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 6-13, 17, 18, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent 1044711 or Polderman in view of Worthington, Tuttle, or Schmit. In Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 6-15, 17, 18, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent 1044711 or Polderman in view of Millard. To more particularly point out one embodiment of the invention, Applicant has canceled claims 4, 5, 18, and 19 and amended claims 1 and 17 to include subject matter that the Examiner has indicated to be allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-13, 17 and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and the claims formally allowed at this time.

Allowable Subject Matter

In Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Examiner has indicated that claims 5 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In addition, Examiner states that claims 16 and 25 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks Examiner for indicating the allowability of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has addressed each and every objection and ground for rejection. The amended claims are patentable over the cited art and Applicant requests that the application be allowed. In the event the Examiner has any questions or there are any issues with respect to the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number below prior to the issuance of any written action.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric J. Puik

By 
Agent, Rachael Stiegel
Registration No. 54,469
(713) 241-1842

P. O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463